Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2005

Docket No. 2091-0248P Art Unit: 3629 Page 7 of 12

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 7 and 8 have been amended. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are independent. Reconsideration of the present application is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph due to failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, with regard to claims 1, 4, and 8, the Examiner has indicated that the phrase "in relation to user information specific to the user and usable only at the store" is unclear. Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily appreciate the significance of this wording of claims 1, 4, and 8. The Examiner is directed to the specification which clearly sets forth the claimed subject matter, for example

Page 5 lines 11-12 recites: "Therefore, the DP number attached to the DP bag can be used as the user information";

Page 7, line 26 to page 6, line 5 recites: "Moreover, since the user information is used only in the store that has carried out the development and the printing of the film, the order is placed only from the order terminal in the store. Therefore, the DPE store can induce the user to use the store without competing with other stores, and the store can increase its profits as a result."; and

Page 8 of 12

Page 10, lines 7-10 recites: "A DP number usable only in the DPE store 1 is printed

as a bar code 23 on the DP bag 21."

In summary, the Examiner should appreciate that the user information is usable only

at the store specified by the user. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that

claims 1, 4, and 8 do in fact properly recite "in relation to user information specific to the

user and usable only at the store". Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 4, and 8 should be

withdrawn. The Examiner will note that independent claim 8 has been amended merely to

place it in better form. These are clearly non-narrowing claim amendments.

Further, with regard to claim 7, the Examiner has indicated that the phrase

"preparing another DP bag in which printed the DP number obtained from the order number

recite inter alia

inputting the user information, accessing the printing terminal with the user

information, receiving an order for a print of the image data related to the user information,

and outputting a reception which an order number corresponding to the order is indicated,

by using the order terminal; and

preparing another DP bag on which is printed the DP number obtained from the

order number indicated on the receipt, reading the image data from the database based on

the order number and printing the image data, by using the printing terminal, storing the

printed image in the another DP bag, and providing the user with the printed image in the

another DP bag in exchange for a presentation of the receipt and payment by the user.

As described in the specification, for example, on page 5, line 4 to page 6, line 9,

each time development is requested by the user, in other words, each time the user places

an order, a DP number is attached to the DP bag, and a receipt with a specific order

number is provided to the user. Later, when the receipt is handed to the DPE store, the

user receives the DP bag for the specific order that was placed earlier.

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 as amended

particularly points out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as

the invention. Therefore, the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 4-6 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly

anticipated by Fredlund et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,666,215); and claims 1-3 and 7 have been

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fredlund et al. in view of

Enomoto et al. (U.S. 5,974,401). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Each of independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 sets forth a combination of

steps/elements, inter alia

"an order terminal installed in the store" and "inputting the user information by using

the order terminal".

Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record, including Fredlund and

Enomoto et al., fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique

combination of limitations of the present invention as set forth in claims 1, 4, 7, and 8. For

example, Fredlund merely discloses facilitating ordering and reordering of print images and

Application No. 09/974,862 Amendment dated January 12, 2006

Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2005

Docket No. 2091-0248P Art Unit: 3629

Page 10 of 12

discloses that the ordering or reordering is done by using a PC at a user's home.

Therefore, the user needs not to go to the DPE store as is required by the present

invention. Enomoto merely discloses that the ordering or reordering is done without going

to the DPE store (see column 7, lines 33-39). In contrast, in the present invention, the

ordering or reordering is done at the DPE store specified by the user. If the user does not

have his PC at home, it is possible to order or reorder print images at the DPE store. The

system provided by the present application improves convenience and user-friendliness in

ordering and reordering of print images.

Further, Enomoto does not disclose an ID number which is used in a specified local

area, as recited in claim 1. As described, Enomoto does not suggest that a user orders or

reorders print images at a specified DPE store. Therefore, it is inappropriate to interpret the

user ID of Enomoto as the ID number of claim 1.

Moreover, even if arguendo, Enomoto discloses the ID number, there is no

motivation to combine the teachings of Enomoto with the system of Fredlund. Fredlund

also does not teach that a user orders or reorders print images at a specified DPE store.

Accordingly, at least for the reasons described above, Applicant respectfully submits

that the prior art of record, including Fredlund and Enomoto et al., fails to teach or suggest

each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the present invention

as set forth in claims 1, 4, 7, and 8. Therefore, independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 are in

condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 are also in condition for allowance

due to their being dependent on allowable independent claims or due to the additional

Application No. 09/974,862 Amendment dated January 12, 2006 Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2005

Docket No. 2091-0248P Art Unit: 3629

Page 11 of 12

novel features set forth therein. Thus, all claims of the present application are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state-of- the-art, no further comments are deemed necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

Applicant respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and § 1.17 for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of \$120.00 is attached hereto.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Carl T. Thomsen, Registration No. 50,786 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 09/974,862 Amendment dated January 12, 2006 Reply to Office Action of September 12, 2005 Docket No. 2091-0248P Art Unit: 3629 Page 12 of 12

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Marc S. Weiner, #32,181

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

MSW/CTT/ags 2091-0248P